UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. /	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/721,220	11/22/2000	Husnain Bajwa	1012-0001	9750

29395 7590 09/21/2004

H. DALE LANGLEY, JR.
THE LAW FIRM OF H. DALE LANGLEY, JR. PC
610 WEST LYNN
AUSTIN, TX 78703

EXAMINER	
MEHRA, INDER P	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2666	

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/721,220	BAJWA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Inder P Mehra	2666	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 November 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *22 November 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to application filed on 11/22/00. Claims 1-28 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 15-17 and 19-24rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 15 recites limitation "the call" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 16 recites limitation "the call" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 recites limitation "the call" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 19 recites the limitation "a packet switched network" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Change "a packet switched network" "the packet switched network" which is recited in line 1.

Claim 23 recites the limitation "the authenticating" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 24 recites the limitation "the authenticating" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 2, 9-10 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Hakim et al** (US Patent No. 6,614,780), hereinafter, Hakim.

For claims 1, 2, 10, and 18, Hakim discloses a method comprising:

- receiving a call at a gateway of a packetized network,(the ITS's provide a gateway service, i.e., the capability to interface between the local telephone network and the Internet (packetized network is Internet , refer to col. 3 lines 58-61), refer to col. 5 lines 27-30);
- directing the call for connection to a feature platform (authentication, as defined in specs at page 4 lines 15-17) via the network, refer to abstract and refer to "rout a call--via router devices", col. 5 lines 15-20, col. 4 lines 42-55;
- performing a service related to the call in the feature platform (refer to "user access authentication and security", col. 4 lines 34-37;

- after performing the service, transferring the call to another location in the network ----gateway and the other location, the connection being independent of the feature platform (refer to col. 4 lines 42-55, col. 5 lines 15-30.
- network comprising: "a packet switched network (, col. 3 lines 59-61, 400 in fig. 4, col. 5 lines 10-15) including one or more gateways coupled to receive calls for the network requiring a feature service, ***as recited by claim 10*** , ITS (cateway), refer to col. 5 lines 20-30 and col. 4 lines 42-54;
- a method of authenticating a received at a packetized voice network, ***as recited by claims 2 and 18,*** (refer to 315 in fig. 3, and col. 3 lines 64-66);
- routing the call from the ingress point to an authentication server (ITS-SP); authenticating the call in the authentication server(authorization ; and routing the call to an egress point on the network instead of the authentication server after authentication, ***as recited by claim 18,*** refer to col. 4 lines 42-54, step 210 in fig. 2.

For claim 9, Hakim discloses the limitations of subject matter as in claim 1 above, including the limitation " wherein the other location is an egress gateway (Thus to route a call an originating ITS 404 just addresses the call to the IP address of the destination ITS 414 (egress gateway), col. 5 lines 28-30, col. 5 lines 20-22).

For claim 17, Hakim discloses "wherein the call is received from a publicly switched telephone network (PSTN), refer to 100 in fig. 1

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3-7, 11-13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hakim, as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, in view of **Fougnies et al** (US Patent No. 5,854,975), hereinafter, Fougnies '975.

For claims 3-7, 11-13 and 16 Hakim discloses all the limitations of subject matter, including the following limitations:

- providing an authentication service as the service in the feature platform, **as recited by claims 3 and 11,** refer to col. 4 lines 42-47;
- wherein the authentication service validates a personal identification number, **as recited by claim 5,** (access code, refer to col. 4 lines 43-45, Caller Idenfication , refer to col. 11 lines 35-37);
- wherein the authentication service includes voice prompts, **as recited by claims 6 and 12,** (prompts the user, col. 4 lines 42-45, in voice network 315 fig. 3);

Hakim does not disclose the following limitations, which are disclosed by Fougnies '975:

- wherein the authentication service validates a calling card number, **as recited by claim 4,** refer to col. 1 lines 19-21, col. 11 lines 55-65, col. 12 lines 7-10, and col. 13 lines 20-25;

- wherein the authentication service utilizes Automatic Number Identification (ANI) information as a basis for authentication, **recited by claims 7 and 13**, refer to abstract, col. 5 lines 40-50, col. 6 lines 5-20, and col. 7 lines 39-42.
- wherein the call is routed to the feature platform according to a destination number identification service (DNIS), **as recited by claim 16,** refer to col. 6 lines 5-10;

Further, Fougnies '975 discloses the following limitations more explicitly, as follows:

- providing an authentication service as the service in the feature platform, **as recited by claims 3 and 11,** refer to col.2 lines 24-26, col. 4 lines5-7 and col. 4 lines 33-40;
- wherein the authentication service validates a personal identification number, **as recited by claim 5,** (refer to col. 9 lines 30-35);
- wherein the authentication service includes voice prompts, **as recited by claims 6 and 12,** (refer to col. 2 lines 19-21, col. 6 lines 40-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the capabilities of calling card number, Automatic Number Identification, personal identification number, voice prompts, (DNIS) and providing authentication service, as taught by Fougnies '975. The suggestion to use these capabilities would have been motivated in order to provide anti-fraud capabilities and facilitates billing.

8. Claims 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hakim, as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, in view of **O'Neal et al** (US Patent No. 6,728,357), hereinafter, O'Neal.

For claims 8 and 14, Hakim discloses all the limitations of the subject matter, with the exception of the following limitation, which is disclosed by O'Neal, as follows:

- providing a follow-me service as the service, refer to col. 11, lines 65-67;

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the capabilities of "follow-me-service". The suggestion to use these capabilities would have been motivated in order to facilitate handle calls appropriately.

9. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hakim, as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, in view of **Burke et al** (US Patent No. 6,728,357), hereinafter, Burke.

For claim 15, Hakim discloses all the limitations of the subject matter, with the exception of the following limitation, which is disclosed by Burke, as follows:

- wherein the call is redirected from the feature platform to other location on the network using a media gateway control protocol, (MGCP communicates information to the distribution network through an alert queue. MGCP is used for telephony communication. refer to col. 5, lines 25-45;

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the capabilities of redirecting calls from the feature platform to other location on the network using a media gateway control protocol, as taught by Burke. This capability can be combined at gateway of the network. The suggestion to use these capabilities would have been motivated in order to facilitate handling of calls appropriately.

10. Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hakim, as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, in view of **Nelson et al** (US Patent No. 6,760, 778), hereinafter, Nelson.

Hakim discloses voice traffic (315 in fig. 3) bearing packet switched network (Internet 301 in fig. 3 and 405 in fig. 4 , col. 1 lines 5-10), the method comprising:

- receiving at a gateway to packet-switched network (the ITS's provide a gateway service, i.e., the capability to interface between the local telephone network and the Internet (packetized network is Internet , refer to col. 3 lines 58-61), refer to col. 5 lines 27-30); an information stream including encoded voice-band traffic originating from voice terminal (311 in fig. 3 and 411 in fig. 4) outside the packet-switched network (Internet 405 in fig. 4;
- directing the information stream over the packet-switched network to an authentication service and thereby establishing a connection between the voice terminal and the authentication service (authentication, as defined in specs at page 4 lines 15-17) via the network, refer to abstract and refer to "rout a call---via router devices", col. 5 lines 15-20, col. 4 lines 42-55;
- upon authentication by the authentication service (refer to "user access authentication and security", col. 4 lines 34-37; disassociating the information stream from the authentication service, redirecting the information stream via the packet-switched network to establish a connection with a target device (refer to col. 4 lines 42-55, col. 5 lines 15-30. After connection to other location, authentication service is transparent to call communication.).

Hakim does not disclose the following limitation explicitly, which is disclosed by Nelson, as follows:

- "an information stream including encoded voice-band traffic refer to col. 10 lines 25-32; originating from voice terminal outside the packet-switched network (IP network, col. 4 lines 55-57".

* wherein the authenticating includes bi-directionaal (full-duplex, col. 10 lines 26-29) communication of encoded voice-band traffic between the voice terminal and the authentication service via the gateway, **as taught by claim 21,** refer to col. 10 lines 25-32 and col. 8 lines 22-24.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the capabilities of "an information stream including encoded voice-band originating from voice terminal outside the packet-switched network, as taught by Nelson. This capability can be combined at gateway of the network. The suggestion to use these capabilities would have been motivated in order to facilitate handling of calls appropriately.

For claim 20, Hakim discloses all the limitations of the subject matter including the following limitation:

- authenticating a credential associated with the information stream using the authentication service (refer to "access code and security, col. 4 lines 35-37 and prompts user for access code to confirm authorization, col. 4 lines 42-46.

11. Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hakim, as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, in view of **Seazholtz et al** (US Patent No.5,594,789), hereinafter, Seazholtz.

Hakim discloses voice traffic (315 in fig. 3) bearing packet switched network (Internet 301 in fig. 3 and 405 in fig. 4 , col. 1 lines 5-10), the method comprising:

- receiving at an authentication service (authentication, as defined in specs at page 4 lines 15-17) in the network a request to authenticate, refer to abstract and refer to "rout a call---via router devices", col. 4 lines 35-38 and lines 42-55 and col. 5 lines 15-20;

Hakim does not disclose the following limitations explicitly, which are disclosed by Seazholtz, as follows:

- authenticate an endpoint for a pay-per-stream distribution of media, ***as also recited by claim 26***, (refer to abstract, col. 1 lines 25-28, col. 1 lines 50-67, col. 7 lines 40-43, col. 9 lines 4-8, col. 25 lines 8-20, and col. 42 lines 9-21;
- upon authentication by the authentication service , directing the pay-per-stream stream distribution of media from a feature service in the network providing the pay-per-stream distribution of media as information stream, (refer to abstract, col. 1 lines 25-28, col. 1 lines 50-67, col. 7 lines 40-43, col. 9 lines 4-8, col. 25 lines 8-20, and col. 42 lines 9-21);
- providing via the packet-switched network a connection between the feature server providing the information stream and the endpoint, refer to col. 2 lines 52-57, and col. 16 lines 13-30.

- wherein the connection between the feature server providing the information stream and the endpoint includes an egress point of the packet switched network, refer to "gateways", col. 3 lines 20-25.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the capability of pay-per-view program upon authorization/ authentication of subscriber, as taught by Seazholtz. This capability can be combined at gateway of the network. The suggestion to use these capabilities would have been motivated in order to facilitate handling of calls appropriately and provide broadband services.

12. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Dowd et al** (US Patent No. 6,141,755),hereinafter, Dowd, in view of **Burke et al** (US Patent No.6,141,755), hereinafter, Burke.

For claim 28, Dowd discloses "an apparatus (fig.1), refer to col. 5 line 65 through col. 6 line 24, comprising:

- a packet switched network (packet switched firewalls 20) including one or more egress points (egress network 22 in fig. 1)coupled to an external telephone network (external network in fig. 1); and
- a feature platform (endpoint authentication , col. 4 lines15-20) coupled to control outgoing calls (determine if a connection should be allowed, col. 3 lines 64-66) for call agents, the outgoing calls connecting respective destination numbers (col. 4 lines 15-20 and respective ones of the cell agents through egress points (refer to col. 11 lines 5-11, connections between the destination numbers and the respective calling

agents being independent of the feature platform after each of the calls is connected, (the connection is functional independently when no intervention by authentication service has taken place);

Dowd does not disclose explicitly "call agent, which is disclosed by burke, refer to col. 5 lines 40-45.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the capability of "call agent, as taught by Burke. This capability can be combined at gateway of the network. The suggestion to use these capabilities would have been motivated in order to facilitate handling of calls appropriately and provide broadband services.

Allowable Subject Matter

13. Claim 22-24 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Prior Art of Record

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Blaze (US Patent No. 5,574,781) discloses a communication system arranged to route a database queried call.
- Cox et al (US Patent No. 6,574,321) discloses management of policies on the usage of telecommunications services.

Conclusion

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Inder P Mehra whose telephone number is 571-272-3170. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8AM to 4 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao, can be reached on 571-272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Inder Pal Mehra

Inder P Mehra
Examiner
Art Unit 2666

DANG TON
PRIMARY EXAMINER